

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action of 30 May 2007. In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims, and makes the following remarks.

***Objection to the Claims***

Examiner has objected to the claims on several grounds. Examiner objects to claim 1 because “lines 3-5 suggest that the ‘input’ is suitable for ensuring accurate time-of-day clock synchronization while in fact it is ‘the encoded time signal’ that is suitable for ensuring accurate time-of-day clock synchronization.” Applicant does not submit to the interpretation of the claim in the Office Action because the phrase “externally generated encoded time signal” is used to modify “input”. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 1 in accordance with Examiner’s suggestion.

Examiner has objected to the limitations in claim 9 lines 3-5 as not being apparatus-type limitations where the preamble “is directed to a system.” Examiner has suggested amending the claim in accordance with claim 1. Again Applicant does not submit to the interpretation of this claim in the Office Action, but has amended the claim accordingly.

Examiner has objected to the mistyping of “ensuring” in claim 9. Applicant has amended claim 9 accordingly.

Examiner has objected to using “a selected operation” in line 8 of claim 9. Applicant has amended claim 9 accordingly.

Examiner also mentioned that claim 9 recites a selected operation but does not set forth what operation is being selected. Applicant respectfully puts forth that the specification recites various operations that could be selected. For example, paragraph 0012 recites that the operation could be sampling signals (such as, for example, from a power system), synchronization of test procedures, or synchronization of communication procedures. Paragraph 0012 further states that the system “could be” used for these operations. Thus, the specification does not indicate that the specific selected operation is essential, and Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to reconsider this objection to claim 9.

Examiner noted that similar comments apply to similar limitations in claim 12. Applicant again does not submit to the interpretations of claim elements in the Office Action, but has amended claim 12 accordingly.

***Response to Examiner's Remarks***

Examiner indicated that he will assume that “the last element of the claim [1] performs synchronous sampling of **analog signals** to output a **sampling synchronization signal**” because, as Examiner stated in the current Office Action, Applicant indicated that “‘synchronous sampling of analog inputs’ is addressed in the last element of the claim [1]”. Office Action, page 4, emphasis not added. Applicant is still unaware of any such requirement that the claim include limitations specifically toward a “goal” stated in a preamble.

Further, Applicant wishes to traverse Examiner's intention to read limitations into claim 1. Applicant stated in the Reply to Office Action of 2 April 2007 “Applicant suggests that the ‘goal’ is *addressed* in the last element of claim 1 in ‘producing an output sampling synchronization signal’.” Reply, page 7, emphasis added. This is not an indication or an admission that the last element *performs* synchronous sampling of analog signals. Examiner's assumed limitations are neither limitations from the body of claim 1 nor suggestions from Applicant's response. Applicant's response, when taken together with the specification indicates that it is the last element in claim 1 that produces the output sampling synchronization signal. The output sampling synchronization signal can be used (as described in the specification) in the performance of various tasks such as, for example, sampling analog signals.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the arguments set forth in this response, this application is now in condition for allowance, and requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued. However, should Examiner be of the opinion that further amendments or response is required, Applicant encourages Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below. Further, although no additional fees are believed to be due at this time, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Cook, Alex, McFarron, Manzo, Cummings & Mehler, Ltd., Deposit Account No. 50-1039 with reference to attorney docket number (1444-0083).

Respectfully submitted,

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

By:   
David Mundt, Reg. No. 41,207

200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 984-0144 (Telephone)  
(312) 984-0146 (Facsimile)